



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

7

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,162	01/26/2001	La Vaughn F. Watts JR.	DC-02758	8091
33438 7590 10/19/2007 HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP P.O. BOX 203518 AUSTIN, TX 78720			EXAMINER YUN, EUGENE	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@hamiltontertile.com
seaton@hamiltontertile.com
tmunoz@hamiltontertile.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,162

Applicant(s)

WATTS ET AL.

Examiner

Eugene Yun

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al. (US 6,779,019) in view of Dobson (US 6,891,887).

Referring to Claim 1, Mousseau teaches a mobile computing system comprising of:

A common communication device 10B and 12B (fig. 2);
a personal computing system (PC) 26 and 28 (fig. 2) coupled to the common communication device, the PC including a storage device capable of receiving and storing messages from the communication device (see col. 13, lines 35-40); and
a personal digital assistant system (PDA) 24 (fig. 2) coupled to the common communication device, the PDA including a storage device capable receiving and storing messages from the communication device, whereby the storage device of the PC is capable of synchronizing messages received from the common communication device with the storage device of the PDA (see col. 6, lines 22-43).

Mousseau does not teach the PC and the PDA capable of controlling the common communication device, but one of the PC and PDA controlling the common communication device at a given time. Dobson teaches the PC 540 (fig. 5) and the PDA

Art Unit: 2618

550 (fig. 5) capable of controlling the common communication device 560 or 570 (fig. 5), but one of the PC and PDA controlling the common communication device at a given time (see col. 9, lines 62-67 and col. 10, lines 1-16 noting that a printer and copier can only perform one operation from one machine at a time). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide to teachings of Dobson to said device of Mousseau in order to provide convenience in data sharing between various types of mobile devices.

Referring to Claim 2, Mousseau also teaches the storage device of the PC as a memory array comprised of a set of records, and the storage device of the PDA is a memory array comprised of a set of records (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 3, Mousseau also teaches direct correspondence established between the set of records of the PC memory array and the set of records of the PDA memory array (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 4, Mousseau also teaches messages synchronized between the memory array of the PC and the memory array of the PDA (see col. 7, lines 27-31).

Referring to Claim 5, Mousseau also teaches messages synchronized between the records of the PC memory array and records of the PDA memory array (see col. 7, lines 27-31).

Referring to Claim 6, Mousseau also teaches a hard disk drive 10A (fig. 1 noting that every desktop computer has a hard disk drive).

Referring to Claim 7, Mousseau also teaches the hard disk drive comprised of a memory array, and the PDA storage device comprised of a memory array, wherein the

Art Unit: 2618

PC hard disk drive memory array corresponds directly to the PDA memory array (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Claim 8 has similar limitations as Claim 1.

Referring to Claim 9, Mousseau also teaches the PDA comprising a memory array where messages are received and entered, and the memory array is synchronized into the PC (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 10, Mousseau also teaches the PC comprised of a memory array synchronized to the memory array of the PDA (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 11, Mousseau also teaches PC comprised of a hard disk drive synchronized to the memory array of the PDA 26 and 28 (fig. 2 noting that every desktop computer has a hard disk drive).

Referring to Claim 12, Mousseau teaches a method of clearing and archiving messages in a dual system computer architecture, the dual system computer architecture including a first computer system 26 and 28 (fig. 2) coupled to a common communication device 10B and 12B (fig. 2) and a second computer system 24 (fig. 2) coupled to the common communication device, the method comprising:

receiving and storing messages by the first computer system to a first memory device (see col. 13, lines 35-40);

synchronizing the messages with the second computer system, whereby the second computer system archives synchronized messages to a second memory device (see col. 6, lines 22-43); and

deleting synchronized and archived messages whenever the first memory device is filled (see col. 23, lines 15-23).

Mousseau does not teach the first computer system and the second computer system being capable of controlling the common communication device with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time. Dobson teaches the first computer system 540 (fig. 5) and the second computer system 550 (fig. 5) being capable of controlling the common communication device 560 or 570 (fig. 5) with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time (see col. 9, lines 62-67 and col. 10, lines 1-16 noting that a printer and copier can only perform one operation from one machine at a time). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide to teachings of Dobson to said device of Mousseau in order to provide convenience in data sharing between various types of mobile devices.

Referring to Claim 13, Mousseau also teaches identifying the deleted messages in the first memory devices (see col. 23, lines 15-23).

Referring to Claim 16, Mousseau teaches a method of clearing and archiving messages in a dual system computer architecture, the dual system computer architecture including a first computer system 26 and 28 (fig. 2) coupled to a common communication device 10B and 12B (fig. 2) and a second computer system 24 (fig. 2) coupled to the common communication device, the method comprising:

receiving and storing messages by the first computer system to a first memory device (see col. 13, lines 35-40);

synchronizing the messages with the second computer system, whereby the second computer system archives synchronized messages to a second memory device (see col. 6, lines 22-43); and

informing a user whenever the first memory device is filled (see col. 23, lines 15-23).

Mousseau does not teach the first computer system and the second computer system being capable of controlling the common communication device with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time. Dobson teaches the first computer system 540 (fig. 5) and the second computer system 550 (fig. 5) being capable of controlling the common communication device 560 or 570 (fig. 5) with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time (see col. 9, lines 62-67 and col. 10, lines 1-16 noting that a printer and copier can only perform one operation from one machine at a time). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide to teachings of Dobson to said device of Mousseau in order to provide convenience in data sharing between various types of mobile devices.

Referring to Claim 17, Mousseau also teaches deleting messages from the first memory device after the messages have been read by the user (see col. 23, lines 1-5).

Referring to Claims 14, 15, 18, and 19, Mousseau also teaches the first computer system as a PDA and the second computer system as a PC (see fig. 1).

Referring to Claims 20-27, Mousseau also teaches setting preferences as to received and stored messages (see col. 24, lines 30-40).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/7/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The only reason the examiner reopened prosecution was that the examiner pointed to the internet network in the Mousseau reference as the common communication device in the previous action. The examiner agreed that the internet network is not a common communication "device" and therefore, pointed to the server computer as the common communication device, which is indeed an actual "device". Other than this deficiency in the previous action, the examiner and the conferees agreed that the combination of the Mousseau and Dobson references teach all the limitations in the independent claims. The claims do not state that the PC and the PDA need to be directly coupled to the common communication device, so therefore, the Dobson reference does teach "the PC and the PDA capable of controlling the common communication device, but one of the PC and PDA controlling the common communication device at a given time" for the reasons stated in the previous action.

In addition, all of the applicant's arguments in the response of 8/7 are based on the network, not the server as recited in the previous action. The previous action

pointed to the server as the common communication device, not the network. Therefore, all the applicant's arguments regarding the network 18 are moot.

4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion


5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Yun whose telephone number is (571) 272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571)272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Eugene Yun
Examiner
Art Unit 2618

EY


MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER